

MYCORRHIZA AND SALSALIC ACID IMPROVING DROUGHT TOLERANCE IN CARNATION *DIANTHUS CARYOPHYLLUS*

Mahmood Sh. Ahmed and Sawsan A. Abdullateef

Dept. of Horticulture and Gardens Engineering, College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences, University of Baghdad, Iraq.

Abstract

An experiment was conducted in a green house at the Department of Horticulture and Gardens Engineering, College of Agriculture, University of Baghdad in Jadriya district for the period from 15-8-2017 to 15-8-2018. Plant roots were inoculated with two levels of mycorrhiza (20.0g) subjected to three irrigation intervals (2 days, 4 days, and 6 days) and salicylic acid was sprayed on the vegetative part in three concentrations (150, 100, 50.0 mg l⁻¹. The results showed that the inoculation of carnation roots with mycorrhiza reduced the effectiveness of SOD (Superoxide dismutase) leaves content of proline, which amounted to 168.2 unit mol/12.72 mg l⁻¹ dry weight. The results also indicated a significant increase in the vegetative growth traits in response to salicylic acid spraying at a concentration of 50 mg l⁻¹ by interacting with mycorrhiza and D2 irrigation interval, namely plant height, dry matter, flower diameter, increasing leaf content of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, zinc, iron and the mycorrhiza infection percentage and roots surface area that reached 94.3 cm, 62.11% 10.79, 4.69%, 0.570%, 6.143%, 87.06%, 179.26%, 77.79% and 146.4g, respectively.

Key words: Carnation, mycorrhiza, salsalic acid, irrigation intervals, Dianthus caryophyllus.

Introduction

Plant growth under certain stress condition like water and salinity is mainly related to the norm of roots response against such stress, which in turn will reflect on the plant growth and yield. Plant production is subjected to different types of biological and non-biological stresses represented by the water, salt, temperature, oxidation, heavy metals and toxicity (Elsahookie, 2013). Water stress is the lack of available water necessary for absorption by the plant at any stage of growth, hence the less available water, may exposed the plant to the state of drought, and therefore the water stress has begun to affect and play key role in the plant normal development. In general, water stress is not only resulted from water deficiency, several stresses like salinity, high temperature, low heat, toxic elements can interact with each other to create higher level of complicated stressful environment (Alvares, 2015).

As a result of the scientific and technical development in addition to the growing need to find sound scientific means that may rationalize the irrigation water consumption. Recently, different techniques have been introduced in rationing water use that have depleted significantly and decreased in a wide range of the glob in general and in Iraq in particular in terms of the sharp decline in the received water from both Tigris and Euphrates rivers which highly fluctuated across the successive seasons.

The using of mycorrhiza as bio-fertilizer have been suggested to minimize the harmful effects of water scarcity by establishing a symbiotic relationship with the plant root system to ensure a higher rate of nutrients uptake, furthermore improving the plant capability to cope with inappropriate growing conditions.

Mycorrhiza has become a well known fungi involving in symbiotic relationship with about 95% of plants root (Read and Smith, 2008). This fungi have a crucial role during water stress (dehydration, salinity, etc.) via hyphae that acted as an open channels supplying soil with additional sources of ventilation and moisture preservation in these soils. Thus, soil will obtain hydroscopic water, which is firmly attached to the soil grains and supplied gradually to the roots. Furthermore, such channels can also extend to several meters in search of water and nutrients (Siddiqui et al., 2008).

Mycorrhiza contributes efficiently in improving the enzymatic activity of a wide range of enzymes such as SOD (Superoxide dismutase), Catalase (CAT), Peroxidase, Phosphatase and Phosphatase dehydrolase, which in part of it will make phosphorus more available for the plants (Abohatem and others, 2011, Doley and Jite, 2013).

Salicylic acid (SA) is a phenolic plant growth regulator that acts as a non-enzymatic antioxidant and co-regulates a number of physiological processes in the plant. This acid plays a crucial role in drawing plant's response to the divergent environmental stresses such as heat stress, osmotic stress and salt stress. This regulation occurred via different mechanisms like organizing the cell membrane permeability (Purcarea and Cosma-Cachita, 2010), as well as the activity of antioxidant enzymes (Ghoohistani *et al.*, 2012).

Materials and methods

The experiment was carried out in the green house at the Department of Horticulture and Gardens Engineering - College of Agriculture/ University of Baghdad in Jadiriya for the period from 15-8-2017 to 15-8-2018. Polyethylene bags (10 kg) filled bottom with gravel then completed with the growing mixture of 1:3 soil and peatmoss. The rooted plants of five nodes developmental stage were inoculated with two levels of mycorrhiza fungi (0, 20 g) named (M0 and M1), then planted and sprayed with four concentrations of salicylic acid (50, 100, 150 mg l⁻¹ named SA, SA50, SA100 and SA150, respectively. Concurrently, plants were subjected

Table 1: Irrigation level (ml) and times for the 2 days irrigation interval.

	Treatment	Irrigation	Water	Nove	Dece	Janu	Febr	Mar	Ар	Ma	Ju	Ju
		number	amount	mber	mber	ary	uary	ch	ril	ys	ne	ly
T1	M0+SA0+2Day	15	←	340	300	250	270	350	380	390	410	450
T2	M0+SA50+2Day	15	←	300	280	230	260	330	340	360	390	420
T3	M0+SA100+2Day	15	←	320	280	240	260	330	340	360	390	420
T4	M0+SA150+2Day	15	←	320	300	240	270	340	370	380	400	440
T13	M1+SA0+2Day	15	←	310	290	220	250	310	360	360	380	430
T14	M1+SA50+2Day	15	\leftarrow	290	270	200	230	290	320	340	360	400
T15	M1+SA100+2Day	15	←	290	270	200	240	290	330	340	370	410
T16	M1+SA150+2Day	15	\leftarrow	310	290	220	250	310	360	360	390	430

Table 2: Irrigation level (ml) and times for the 4 days irrigation interval.

	Treatment	Irrigation	Water	Nove	Dece	Janu	Febr	Mar	Ар	Ma	Ju	Ju
		number	amount	mber	mber	ary	uary	ch	ril	ys	ne	ly
T5	M0+SA0+4Day	7	←	400	360	340	320	380	420	460	490	570
T6	M0+SA50+4Day	7	←	380	330	310	300	360	390	420	440	540
T7	M0+SA100+4Day	7	←	380	330	320	300	370	390	420	450	550
T8	M0+SA150+4Day	7	←	400	340	340	310	380	410	460	470	570
T17	M1+SA0+4Day	7	←	330	280	260	300	350	390	430	470	550
T18	M1+SA50+4Day	7	←	290	240	220	260	310	340	390	440	510
T19	M1+SA100+4Day	7	\leftarrow	300	240	230	270	310	350	390	450	520
T20	M1+SA150+4Day	7	←	320	270	250	300	340	380	420	470	540

Table 3: Irrigation level (ml) and times for the 6 days irrigation interval.

	Treatment	Irrigation	Water	Nove	Dece	Janu	Febr	Mar	Ар	Ma	Ju	Ju
		number	amount	mber	mber	ary	uary	ch	ril	ys	ne	ly
T9	M0+SA0+6Day	5	←	500	490	440	490	510	540	590	640	700
T10	M0+SA50+6Day	5	←	460	440	410	450	480	500	540	600	640
T11	M0+SA100+6Day	5	←	460	440	420	460	480	510	540	610	640
T12	M0+SA150+6Day	5	←	490	480	440	480	500	540	570	630	690
T21	M1+SA0+6Day	5	\leftarrow	470	460	400	440	470	500	540	600	670
T22	M1+SA50+6Day	5	\leftarrow	440	430	360	400	450	450	510	550	630
T23	M1+SA100+6Day	5	\leftarrow	450	430	370	410	450	460	510	560	640
T24	M1+SA150+6Day	5	\leftarrow	470	450	390	440	470	490	530	580	670

to three irrigation intervals (D2 irrigation after 2 days, D4 irrigation after four days, D6 irrigation after six days, respectively). The field experiment was carried out according to the RCBD design with three replicates for

A) in	Mycor-	rhiza M		M0			Ml				ges														
l salicylic acid (S.	ntervals Irriga-	tion(D)day	Day	D2	D4	D6	D2	D4	D6	LSD	Salicylic avera	LSD	a			M0	M1	LSD	tion			D2	D4	D6	LSD
erval anc	A li		0VS	236.7	326.0	472.7	147.7	209.3	310.3		283.8		ycorrhiz	\mathbf{SA}	0	345.1	222.4		ls irriga	SA	0	192.2	267.7	391.5	
ation int	c acid S [,]		SA-50	165.3	273.3	251.3	96.3	158.0	112.0		176.1		ic X M	-A-	50	230.0	122.1		interva	-YS	50	130.8	215.7	181.7	
iza, irrig	Salicylid		SA-100	174.7	285.0	294.0	115.7	163.7	189.0		203.7		Salicyl	- VS	100	251.2	156.1		licylic X	-A-	100	145.2	224.3	241.5	
of mycorrh			SA-150	180.3	287.0	310.7	117.3	201.7	197.3	25.7	215.7	10.5		-A-	150	259.3	172.1	14.9	Sa	-A-	150	148.8	244.3	254.0	18.2
Table 4: Effect o SOD.	UXIN		D	189.2	292.8	332.2	119.2	183.2	202.2	12.9				Average	Mycorrhiza	271.4	168.2	7.4		Average inter-	vals Irrigation	154.2	238.0	267.2	9.1
the <i>lus</i> .	-i	Μ																							
A) in ophyl	Myc	rhiza		MO			M1				c acid														
l salicylic acid (SA) in n Dianthus caryyophyl	ntervals Irriga- Myo	tion(D)day rhiza	Day	D2 M0	D4	D6	D2 M1	D4	D6	LSD	Average Salicylic acid	LSD	hiza			M0	M1		ı intervals			D2	D4	D6	
erval and salicylic acid (SA) in weight) in <i>Dianthus caryyophyl</i>	A intervals Irriga- Myo	tion(D)day rhiza	SA0 Day	9.79 D2 M0	13.77 D4	39.25 D6	6.00 D2 M1	9.46 D4	29.55 D6	ISD	17.97 Average Salicylic acid	ISD	My corrhiza	SA	0	20.94 M0	15.00 M1		rrigation intervals	SA	0	7.89 D2	11.61 D4	34.40 D6	
sation interval and salicylic acid (SA) in $\log g^{-1} dry$ weight) in <i>Dianthus caryyophyl</i>	ic acid SA intervals Irriga- Myc	tion(D)day rhiza	SA-50 SA0 Day	6.50 9.79 D2 M0	6.68 13.77 D4	29.31 39.25 D6	2.09 6.00 D2 M1	2.72 9.46 D4	25.74 29.55 D6	ISD	22.17 17.97 Average Salicylic acid	ISD	acid X Mycorrhiza	SA- SA	50 0	14.16 20.94 M0	10.18 15.00 M1		X Irrigation intervals	SA- SA	50 0	4.30 7.89 D2	4.70 11.61 D4	27.52 34.40 D6	
hiza, irrigation interval and salicylic acid (SA) in proline (mg g^1 dry weight) in <i>Dianthus caryyophyl</i>	Salicylic acid SA intervals Irriga- Myo	tion(D)day rhiza	SA-100 SA-50 SA0 Day	7.11 6.50 9.79 D2 M0	10.08 6.68 13.77 D4	33.26 29.31 39.25 D6	6.54 2.09 6.00 D2 M1	6.04 2.72 9.46 D4	29.03 25.74 29.55 D6	TSD	14.18 12.17 17.97 Average Salicylic acid	TSD	Salicylic acid X Mycorrhiza	SA- SA- SA	100 50 0	16.82 14.16 20.94 M0	11.54 10.18 15.00 MI	LSD	cylic acid X Irrigation intervals	SA- SA- SA	100 50 0	4.83 4.30 7.89 D2	6.56 4.70 11.61 D4	31.14 27.52 34.40 D6	LSD
of mycorrhiza, irrigation interval and salicylic acid (SA) in ontent of proline (mg g^{-1} dry weight) in <i>Dianthus caryyophyl</i>	Salicylic acid SA intervals Irriga- Myo	tion(D)day rhiza	SA-150 SA-100 SA-50 SA0 Day	11.32 7.11 6.50 9.79 D2 M0	10.73 10.08 6.68 13.77 D4	34.80 33.26 29.31 39.25 D6	6.49 6.54 2.09 6.00 D2 M1	4.88 6.04 2.72 9.46 D4	31.19 29.03 25.74 29.55 D6	2.34 LSD	16.57 14.18 12.17 17.97 Average Salicylic acid	0.96 LSD	Salicylic acid X My corrhiza	SA- SA- SA- SA	150 100 50 0	18.95 16.82 14.16 20.94 M0	14.19 11.54 10.18 15.00 M1	1.35 LSD	Salicylic acid X Irrigation intervals	SA- SA- SA- SA	150 100 50 0	8.91 4.83 4.30 7.89 D2	7.80 6.56 4.70 11.61 D4	32.99 31.14 27.52 34.40 D6	1.66 LSD

nitroge	n content	$(\%)$ in D_i	ianthus .	caryyop	hyllus.	`	leaves	dry matter	: (%) in D	ianthus e	caryyop	hyllus.	
MXD		Salicyli	c acid S.	¥	intervals Irriga-	Mycor-	OXIM		Salicyli	c acid S/	ł	intervals Irriga-	Mycor-
					tion(D)day	rhiza M						tion(D)day	rhiza M
D	SA-150	SA-100	SA-50	SA0	Day		D	SA-150	SA-100	SA-50	SA0	Day	
2.98	2.45	3.23	3.41	2.84	D2	M0	13.90	11.61	14.71	16.18	13.11	D2	M0
2.59	2.09	2.90	3.18	2.19	D4		12.20	8.83	13.66	16.00	10.31	Ъ4	
1.48	1.07	1.71	1.90	1.22	D6		5.53	6.24	5.39	6.06	4.45	ß	
3.92	3.36	4.09	4.69	3.53	D2	M1	20.44	18.39	20.39	26.11	16.87	D2	M1
3.80	3.00	4.43	4.63	3.13	D4		15.09	10.42	11.25	25.85	12.84	P4	
2.15	1.90	2.33	2.37	1.99	D6		6.64	6.50	6.80	7.57	5.71	ß	
0.15	0.29				ISD		0.97	1.95				LSD	
	2.31	3.12	3.36	2.49	Average salicy	lic acid		10.33	12.03	16.30	10.55	Average salicyl	ic acid
	0.12				ISD			0.80				LSD	
	salic	ylic acid	X Myco	rrhiza					salicylic	acid X N	1 ycorrł	liza	
Average	SA-	SA-	-W-	\mathbf{SA}			Average	-W-	-A-	SA-	\mathbf{SA}		
Mycorrhiza	150	100	50	0			Mycorrhiza	150	100	50	0		
2.35	1.87	2.61	2.83	2.09	MO		10.55	8.89	11.25	12.75	9.29	M0	
3.29	2.75	3.62	3.90	2.88	M1		14.06	11.77	12.82	19.84	11.80	MI	
0.08	0.17				LSD		0.56	1.13	LSD				
	salic	ylic acid	X irri	gation i	nterval			sali	icylic acid	X Irriga	tion in	tervals	
Average irriga-	- SA-	SA-	SA-	\mathbf{SA}			Average Irriga-	-SA-	-A-	SA-	\mathbf{SA}		
tion interval	150	100	50	0			tion intervals	150	100	50	0		
3.45	2.91	3.66	4.05	3.19	D2		17.17	15.00	17.55	21.15	14.99	D2	
3.20	2.55	3.67	3.91	2.66	D4		13.64	9.63	12.45	20.93	11.57	D4	
1.81	1.49	2.02	2.13	1.60	D6		609	6.37	6.10	6.81	5.08	D6	
0.10	0.21				TSD		0.69	1.38	LSD				

Table 7: Effect of Mycorrhiza, irrigation interval and salicylic acid (SA) in the Table 6: Effect of Mycorrhiza, irrigation interval and salicylic acid (SA) in the

the three studied factors, respectively. Least significance differences of 0.05 was adopted to compare between the treatments means.

Study Indicators:

Leaves content of proline: Proline is estimated according to Bates et al. (1973). SOD (Superoxide dismutase) activity was estimated following Nitrotetrazolium (NBT) and riboflavin method (yang et al., 2006). Leaves dry matter (%): The percentage of dry matter was calculated for the vegetative part in each experimental unit. Ten grams of fresh leaves weight was sampled and dried in the oven at 70°C till it reached the constant weight, then weighted with sensitive balance to find out the percentage of dry matter as follows; dry weight / fresh weight \times 100. Flower diameter (cm): Nine flowers were randomly taken in the full bloom phase and the maximum width between two petals of each flower was adopted to estimate this trait. Length of flower stem (cm): represented by the total plant height from the soil surface to the highest peak of the four plant branches (Abdali, 2002). Nitrogen (%): The percentage of nitrogen content was estimated according to Micro-Kejldahl method (Jones, 1970). Phosphorus (%): The leaves content of phosphorus at the beginning of flowering stage was estimated by adding ascorbic acid and ammonium sulphides, then estimated by Spectrophotometer (Olsen and Sommers, 1982). Potassium (%): The leaves content of potassium was estimated with aid of Flame photometer at 766 nm. Zinc (%) and Iron (%): Spectrophoto Atomic Absorption was used to estimate the percentage of Zinc and Iron elements. Root infection percentage (%): The percentage of root infection with mycorrhiza was estimated at the end of the experiment in the Labs of the Agricultural Researches Board-Ministry of Science and Technology. Three plants were randomly selected to cut their roots and the round soil was taken too to estimate the infection percentage according to Kormanik et al., (1982).

Results and discussion

SOD activity (u ml⁻¹): The results listed in table 4 clearly indicated the significant effect of mycorrhiza fungi in decreasing the SOD activity to reach 168.2 (unit ml⁻¹), whereas, D2 interval has a decreased SOD activity which was about 154.2 unit ml⁻¹.

For SA levels, the enzymatic activity was significantly increased against the control treatment reached 283.8 u ml⁻¹ (Table 4). Meanwhile, the same table showed a significant effect of interaction between the mycorrhizal inoculation and irrigation intervals revealing a significant decrease in SOD activity in the treatment of M1D2 (mycorrhiza and 2 days interval), while the enzyme activity decreased in the M1D2 treatment scored 122.1 u ml⁻¹. At the same time, the results confirmed the interaction of irrigation interval and salsalic acid. The treatment of the D6SA0 has an increased enzymatic activity up to 391.5 u ml⁻¹. The three studied factors interacted significantly in both directions, increasing and decreasing the SOD activity that reached 472.7 u ml⁻¹ for M0D6SA0 treatment and 96.3 u ml⁻¹ for M1D2SA50 treatment.

Proline content (mg g⁻¹ dry weight): The mycorrhiza had the ability to reduce the leaves content of proline in M1 treatment (12.72 mg g⁻¹ dry weight). For the irrigation intervals, D2 interval had the lowest leaves content of proline (6.48 mg g⁻¹ dry weight). As for the SA levels, leaves content of proline showed a significant reduction to be 12.17 mg g⁻¹ dry weight at the concentration of 50 mg l⁻¹. The interaction between the mycorrhiza and irrigation intervals resulted in a significant decrease in the leaves content of proline reaching 4.28 mg kg⁻¹ dry weight in M1D2 treatment. SA and irrigation intervals significantly affected the leaves content of proline that reduced in the D2SA50 treatment to be 4.30 mg g^{-1} dry weight. Both, M1D2SA50 and M1D4SA50 treatments had a reduced content of proline (2.09 and 2.27 mg g⁻¹ dry weight, respectively), on the other hand proline content was increased in M0D6SA0 treatment to be 39.25 mg g^{-1} dry weight.

Leaves dry matter (%): Mycorrhiza resulted in a significantly higher percentage of leaves dry matter (14.60%). Table 6 cleared that the D2 interval achieved the maximum mean (17.17%) which was significantly higher than the rest of the treatments that D6 scored its minimal vale (9.06%). Also, salicylic acid levels, particularly 50 mg l⁻¹ affected significantly trait mean (1630%). The interaction between mycorrhiza and the irrigation intervals showed significant effects as M1D2 was superior (20.44%). D2SA50 and D4SA50 treatments were significantly different compared with other treatments scoring 21.15% and 20.93%, respectively. D6SA0 treatment revealed the lowest percentage of leaves dry matter (5.08%). Although, M1D2SA50 and M1D4SA50 had no significant difference against each other in context leaves dry matter, both were significantly higher than the other treatments with 26.11% and 25.28%.

Nitrogen: The results of table (6) showed that the mycorrhizal treatment of M1 was significantly higher than other biofertilizer treatments (3.29%). Salicylic acid (SA) treatment of 50 mg l⁻¹ was in the lead achieving the highest mean of nitrogen content (3.36%). M1D2 and M1D4 were in significantly higher interaction means between mycorrhiza fungi and irrigation intervals (3.92% and 3.80%, respectively). From the same table, SA found to interact significantly with the irrigation intervals especially D2SA50 and D4SA50 treatments, which were significantly higher than the other treatments by reaching 4.05% and 3.91%, respectively. The triple interaction indicated that M1D2SA50 and M1D4SA50 treatments increased the nitrogen content up to 4.69% and 4.63%.

potassi	um conter	tt (%) in J	Dianthu	s caryyo	phyllus.		phosph	orus cont	ent (%) in	Dianth	us cary)	vophyllus.	
UXW		Salicyli	c acid S ₁	V	intervals Irriga-	Mycor-	UXIV		Salicylid	c acid S/		ntervals Irriga-	Mycor-
					tion(D)day	rhiza M						tion(D)day	rhiza M
D	SA-150	SA-100	SA-50	SA0	Day		D	SA-150	SA-100	SA-50	SA0	Day	
3.279	2.857	3.157	4.440	2.663	D2	M0	0.318	0.293	0.323	0.360	0.293	D2	M0
2.690	1.837	2.357	4.300	2.267	D4		0.291	0.267	0.293	0.320	0.283	D4	
1.673	1.430	1.900	2.253	1.110	D6		0.203	0.187	0.210	0.220	0.193	D6	
5.060	4.253	5.310	6.143	4.533	D2	M1	0.436	0.333	0.497	0.570	0.343	D2	M1
4.589	3.970	4.013	6.103	4.270	D4		0.413	0.293	0.473	0.560	0.323	D4	
2.926	2.350	3.153	3.633	2.567	D6		0.226	0.207	0.230	0.243	0.223	D6	
0.286	0.572				LSD		0.014	0.028				LSD	
	2.783	3.315	4.479	2.902	Average salicyl	ic acid		0.263	0.338	0.379	0.277	Average salicyli	c acid
	0.234				LSD			0.011				LSD	
	5	alicylic a	cid X N	Aycorrh	iiza				salicylic a	acid X N	Iycorrh	iza	
Average	-WS	-VS	-YS	\mathbf{SA}			Average	SA-	SA-	SA-	\mathbf{SA}		
Mycorrhiza	150	100	50	0			Mycorrhiza	150	100	50	0		
2.548	2.041	2.471	3.664	2.013	M0		0.270	0.249	0.276	0.300	0.257	M0	
4.192	3.524	4.159	5.293	3.790	M1		0.358	0.278	0.400	0.458	0.297	M1	
0.165	0.330				LSD		0.008	0.016				LSD	
	salic	ylic acid	X irrig	gation ir	iterval			salic	ylic acid 2	X irrigat	ion inte	rval	
Average irriga-	· SA-	-A-	-A-	\mathbf{SA}			Average irriga-	-A-	-VS	-A-	\mathbf{SA}		
tion interval	150	100	50	0			tion interval	150	100	50	0		
4.170	3.555	4.233	5.292	3.598	D2		0.377	0.313	0.410	0.465	0.318	D2	
3.640	2.903	3.185	5.202	3.268	D4		0.352	0.280	0.383	0.440	0.303	D4	
2.300	1.890	2.527	2.943	1.838	D6		0.214	0.197	0.220	0.232	0.208	D6	
0.202	0.405				LSD		0.010	0.020				LSD	

Table 9: Effect of Mycorrhiza, irrigation interval and salicylic acid (SA) in the Table 8: Effect of Mycorrhiza, irrigation interval and salicylic acid (SA) in the

Phosphorus (%): The results presented in table 7 showed that the percentage of phosphorus was significantly increased by 0.358% in response to the

mycorrhizal biofertilizer compared to 0.270% in the control. In addition, D2 treatment has significantly higher phosphorus content than the other irrigation interval

(SA) i	· Myco	rhiza N	1	M0		1	Ml				ylic acid														
d salicylic acid	ntervals Irriga-	tion(D)day	Day	D2	₽ Z	B	D2	₽ Z	D6	ISD	Average salic	ISD				M0	M1	ISD	iterval			D2	A	D6	ISD
terval an vophyllus	A İ		SA0	43.43	36.76	21.91	61.67	52.99	31.03		41.30		orrhiza	\mathbf{SA}	0	34.03	48.56		gation in	SA	0	52.55	44.87	26.47	
gation in <i>ws cary</i> y	c acid S.		SA-50	62.41	58.18	28.58	87.06	85.36	38.67		60.04		d X Myc	-W-	50	49.72	70.37		X irri	SA-	50	74.74	71.77	33.62	
chiza, irri in <i>Dianth</i>	Salicyli		SA-100	53.76	49.59	26.09	73.12	71.39	35.83		51.63		icylic aci	-A-	100	43.15	60.11		ylic acid	SA-	100	63.44	60.49	30.96	
of Mycori tent (%)			SA-150	39.51	33.03	21.41	54.07	46.20	27.39	3.53	36.94	1.44	sali	SA-	150	31.32	42.56	2.04	salic	SA-	150	46.79	39.61	24.40	2.49
Table 10: Effect zinc con	MXD		D	49.78	44.39	24.50	68.98	63.98	33.23	1.76				Average	Mycorrhiza	39.56	55.40	1.02		Average irriga-	tion interval	59.38	54.19	28.86	1.25
v) in the	Mycor-	hiza M		M0			M1				cid														
N N	F.	ч									ic a														
l salicylic acid (SA <i>llus</i> .	ntervals Irriga-	tion(D)day r	Day	D2	D4	D6	D2	D4	D6	LSD	Average salicylic a	LSD	rhiza			M0	M1	LSD	val			D2	D4	D6	LSD
erval and salicylic acid (SA uryyophyllus.	A intervals Irriga-	tion(D)day r	SA0 Day	6.28 D2	5.55 D4	4.00 D6	7.67 D2	6.83 D4	5.78 D6	LSD	6.02 Average salicylic a	LSD	K Mycorrhiza	SA	0	5.28 M0	6.76 M1	LSD	ion interval	SA	0	6.98 D2	6.19 D4	4.89 D6	LSD
gation interval and salicylic acid (SA anthus caryyophyllus.	c acid SA intervals Irriga-	tion(D)day r	SA-50 SA0 Day	6.93 6.28 D2	6.80 5.55 D4	4.86 4.00 D6	10.79 7.67 D2	10.76 6.83 D4	6.35 5.78 D6	ISD	7.75 6.02 Average salicylic a	LSD	lic acid X Mycorrhiza	SA- SA	50 0	6.20 5.28 M0	9.30 6.76 M1	LSD	X irrigation interval	SA- SA	50 0	8.86 6.98 D2	8.78 6.19 D4	5.61 4.89 D6	LSD
chiza, irrigation interval and salicylic acid (SA cm) in <i>Dianthus caryyophyllus</i> .	Salicylic acid SA intervals Irriga-	tion(D)day r	SA-100 SA-50 SA0 Day	6.72 6.93 6.28 D2	6.15 6.80 5.55 D4	4.38 4.86 4.00 D6	7.62 10.79 7.67 D2	7.48 10.76 6.83 D4	5.94 6.35 5.78 D6	ISD	6.38 7.75 6.02 Average salicylic a	LSD	salicylic acid X Mycorrhiza	SA- SA- SA	100 50 0	5.75 6.20 5.28 M0	7.01 9.30 6.76 M1	ISD	ylic acid X irrigation interval	SA- SA- SA	100 50 0	7.17 8.86 6.98 D2	6.82 8.78 6.19 D4	5.16 5.61 4.89 D6	I ISD
of Mycorrhiza, irrigation interval and salicylic acid (S ^A iameter (cm) in <i>Dianthus caryyophyllus</i> .	Salicylic acid SA intervals Irriga-	tion(D)day r	SA-150 SA-100 SA-50 SA0 Day	6.17 6.72 6.93 6.28 D2	5.45 6.15 6.80 5.55 D4	4.24 4.38 4.86 4.00 D6	7.08 7.62 10.79 7.67 D2	7.29 7.48 10.76 6.83 D4	5.96 5.94 6.35 5.78 D6	0.51 LSD	6.03 6.38 7.75 6.02 Average salicylic a	0.21 LSD	salicylic acid X Mycorrhiza	SA- SA- SA- SA	150 100 50 0	5.29 5.75 6.20 5.28 M0	6.78 7.01 9.30 6.76 M1	0.29 LSD	salicylic acid X irrigation interval	SA- SA- SA- SA	150 100 50 0	6.63 7.17 8.86 6.98 D2	6.37 6.82 8.78 6.19 D4	5.10 5.16 5.61 4.89 D6	0.36 IISD

treatments being 0.270%. Using of salicylic acid at a concentration of 50 mg 1⁻¹, phosphorus percentage reached a significant level (0.379%). Data of table 7

indicated a significant increase in the phosphorus percentage in response to the interacted effect of mycorrhiza and D2 irrigation interval (M1D2), hence the leaves content of phosphorus was 0.436%. From the same table, it can be noticed that the higher interaction between the irrigation interval and salicylic acid (0.465%) was recorded by D2SA50 followed by D4SA50 treatment (0.440%). The three practiced factors interact in a significant way when M1D2SA50 and M1D4SA50 achieved the highest values (0.570% and 0.560%, respectively).

Potassium (%): Results of the statistical analysis presented in table 8 showed that the mycorrhizal fungi (M1) was beyond the significant level with 4.192% potassium content. Furthermore, the second irrigation interval (D2) was significantly higher than the other intervals scoring 4.170% for potassium content. Salicylic acid had a clear effect in the percentage of potassium especially the concentration of 50 mg l⁻¹ 4.479%. The interaction between the M1 mycorrhizal treatment and the D2 irrigation interval increased the percentage of potassium in a significant way reaching 5.060% followed by D4SA50 treatment with 4.589% potassium content. Irrigation intervals and SA has derived the potassium content in both, D2SA50 and D4SA50 treatments to significantly increased up to 5.292% and 5.202%, respectively. In the case of triple interaction between all studied factors, M1D2SA50 and M1D4SA50 were in the lead reaching the maximal values of 6.143% and 6.103%, respectively.

Zinc (%): Significant differences in the zinc content (Table 9) were detected between the subjected bioconcentrations of mycorrhiza. The M1 mycorrhizal treatment was significantly higher than other treatments reaching 55.40% of zinc percentage. For the irrigation interval treatments, the D2 increased significantly in the percentage of zinc content (59.38%). The different concentrations of salicylic acid had a significant effect in respect of zinc percentage, thus the concentration of 50 mg l^{-1} achieved the highest value (60.04%). The M1D2 treatment was 68.98%, followed by M1D4 treatment (63.98%). Irrigation intervals interacted significantly with the different levels of salicylic acid, so, D2SA50 was superior as it scored 74.74% followed by D4SA50 treatment with 71.74%. In the same table, M1D2SA50 and M1D4SA50 indicated significant interaction between the three studied factors acheiving 87.06% and 85.36% of zinc content, respectively.

This may be due to the exceptional ability of these fungi to produce a variety of nutritional compounds that have a significant role in improving physiological activities and increasing plants ability to the absorb water and macro- and/or micro-nutrients, which in turn improves plant growth and productivity (Kaschuk *et al.*, 2010). The significant reduction in the vegetative growth of carnation plants subjected to different intervals of irrigation may have been due to the direct effects of water stress inhibiting the enzymatic activity of several enzymes like SOD and resulting in imbalance nutritional system disrupting the cellular membranes function and plant metabolism in general. Such effects will negatively reflect on the photosynthetic process, and electron transfer in the energy production (Cha-Um and Kirdmanee, 2009). The previously stated results showed that salicylic acid spraying improved the vegetative traits by reducing the absorption of Na⁺ and Cl ions. It has a crucial role in facilitating the absorption of nitrates, magnesium, iron, manganese and copper. Salicylic acid has a significant effect in increasing photosynthesis rate and increasing nutrients absorption that in total will reflect on plant growth (Liu et al., 2017).

Flower diameter (cm): The results of table 10 indicated that there was a significant effect of mycorrhiza in the flower diameter, that M1 mycorrhiza treatment achieved the highest mean of 7.46 cm compared to the control treatment (M0) that achieved the lowest mean (5.63 cm).

Length of flower stem (cm): The results of table 12 indicated that the biological mycorrhizal fertilizer was had superior effect on plant height. The M1 treatment gave the highest value for plant height of 65.7 cm. The irrigation intervals included two days interval (D2) reached plant height of 70.8 cm, whereas, the effect of salicylic acid at the concentration of 50 mg l⁻¹ was superior (73.1 cm) compared to the other spraying levels. Interaction found to be significant between the M1 mycorrhizal treatment and the D2 (2 days) irrigation interval, and higher than the other interaction effects, reaching 76.3 cm.

Interaction between irrigation intervals and the different salicylic acid levels showed a significant variation. Both, D2 and D4 treatments exceeded the significantly threshold at the concentration of 50 mg l⁻¹ reaching 85.9 cm and 83.2 cm, respectively. While the lowest interaction value was achieved by the D6 treatment and 150 mg l⁻¹ producing a plant height of 43.1 cm. The treatments M1D2SA50 and M1D4S50 recorded the highest values of plant height (94.3 cm and 91.2 cm, respectively), meanwhile M0D6SA150 was on the opposite direction as it gave the lowest plant height (41.0 cm). For the triple interaction, M1D2SA50 and M1D4SA50 recorded the lowest mean for the studied trait that was about 179.26% and 172.62%.

The iron content was sharply declined in M1D4SA50

Table 13: Effection mycorr	t of Mycor hiza infect	rthiza, irri tion perce	gation in ntage (%	terval ar) in <i>Dia</i>	id salicylic acid (\$ inthus caryyophy	5A) in the llus.	Table 12: Effect length	of Mycor of flower s	rhiza, irri tem (cm)	gation in in <i>Diant</i>	terval a hus car	nd salicylic acid (S <i>yyophyllus</i> .	A) in the
MXD		Salicyli	c acid S ²		ntervals Irriga-	Mycor-	OXM		Salicylid	c acid S/	ł	intervals Irriga-	Mycor-
					tion(D)day	rhiza M						tion(D)day	rhiza M
D	SA-150	SA-100	SA-50	SA0	Day		D	SA-150	SA-100	SA-50	SA0	Day	
11.85	9.12	12.06	15.34	10.88	D2	M0	65.3	53.2	70.3	77.5	60.1	D2	MO
10.34	8.72	10.40	11.78	10.46	D4		60.1	49.7	62.7	75.1	53.0	D4	
4.00	1.73	6.75	7.51	0.00	ß		43.1	41.0	43.4	46.4	41.6	D6	
54.35	41.08	57.48	<i>91.77</i>	41.05	D2	M1	76.3	59.9	80.4	94.3	70.6	D2	M1
44.49	27.80	47.26	67.44	35.47	Þ		70.4	58.4	69.8	91.2	62.0	D4	
23.98	14.45	29.80	33.18	18.50	ß		50.5	45.3	51.9	54.2	50.7	D6	
5.17	10.33				LSD		2.40	4.80				LSD	
	17.15	27.29	35.51	19.39	Average salicylic	c acid		51.2	63.1	73.1	56.3	Average salicyli	c acid
	4.22				LSD			1.958				ISD	
	ŝ	alicylic ac	id X M	lycorrhi	za				salicyli	c acid 2	K Myco	rrhiza	
Average	SA-	SA-	SA-	SA			Average	SA-	- VS	-A-	\mathbf{SA}		
Mycorrhiza	150	100	50	0			Mycorrhiza	150	100	50	0		
8.73	6.52	9.74	11.54	7.11	M0		56.2	48.0	58.8	66.3	515	M0	
40.94	27.78	44.85	59.47	31.67	M1		65.7	54.5	67.4	6.6L	61.1	M1	
2.98	5.97				LSD		1.39	2.77				LSD	
	salic	ylic acid	X irri	gation ii	iterval			sal	icylic aci	d X ir	rigatio	n interval	
Average irriga-	- SA-	-A-	-WS	\mathbf{SA}			Average irriga-	-SA-	-YS	-A-	\mathbf{SA}		
tion interval	150	100	50	0			tion interval	150	100	50	0		
33.10	25.10	34.77	46.56	25.96	D2		70.8	56.6	75.4	85.9	65.3	D2	
27.42	18.26	28.83	39.61	22.96	Þ		65.2	54.1	66.3	83.2	57.5	D4	
13.99	8.09	18.27	20.35	9.25	D6		46.8	43.1	47.6	50.3	46.1	D6	
3.65	7.31				LSD		1.70	3.39				LSD	

5 E ft, ¢ Ē treatment reaching iron 112.70%. The results obtained from the tables of flower parameters indicated a clear effect of mycorrhiza in improving flowering traits.

Vegetative and syphilis resulting in an increase in all floral traits (Bashan, 2010 and Elrys, 2018). The improved floral traits may be attributed to the active role of salicylic acid

MXD		Salicyli	c acid S	4	intervals Irriga- tion(D)day	Mycor- rhiza M
D	SA-150	SA-100	SA-50	SA0	Day	
115.8	109.0	118.6	120.2	115.5	D2	MO
110.1	96.2	116.6	119.1	108.5	D4	
68.2	60.5	72.2	74.8	65.4	D6	
131.4	120.0	133.7	146.4	125.6	D2	M1
125.6	111.0	128.4	144.1	119.0	D4	
83.9	75.8	87.3	91.4	81.1	D6	
2.4	4.8				LSD	
	95.4	109.5	116.0	102.5	Average salicyli	c acid
	2.0				LSD	
		salicylic	acid X	Mycor	rhiza	
Average	SA-	SA-	SA-	SA		
Mycorrhiza	150	100	50	0		
98.0	88.6	102.5	104.7	96.4	M0	
113.6	102.2	116.5	127.3	108.5	M1	
1.4	2.8				LSD	
	salic	ylic acid X	K irrigati	on inter	val	
Average irriga-	SA-	SA-	SA-	SA		
tion interval	150	100	50	0		
123.6	114.5	126.2	133.3	120.5	D2	
117.9	103.6	122.5	131.6	113.7	D4	
76.0	68.2	79.7	83.1	73.2	D6	
17	34				ISD	

Table 14: Effect of Mycorrhiza, irrigation interval and salicylic acid (SA) in the followed by M1D4SA50 treatment roots surface area (cm²) in *Dianthus caryyophyllus*.

in the production of internal auxins. The acid also shares some enzymes to form proteins and preserve the genetic material to synthesize more DNA, in addition to its effect on the transfer of crude and elaborated sap. The increase in the number of flowers, which may be due to the induction role of salicylic acid that may accelerate the photosynthesis process (Hayat and Ahmed, 2010).

The results of table 13 showed an increase in the percentage of infected roots in response to the mycorrhiza inoculation. The M1 treatment of fungi recorded a percentage of 40.94%. The D2 irrigation interval resulted in the highest percentage of infected roots reaching 33.10%, as well as the salicylic acid spraying was significantly differentiated at 50 mg l⁻¹ scoring a percentage of infected roots about 35.15%. Also, the interaction between the mycorrhizal biofertilizer and the irrigation intervals was superior in M1D2 treatment achieving 54.35%. The interaction between the irrigation intervals and the salicylic acid levels showed a significant effect in this trait, thus both D2SA50 and D4SA50 treatments increasing the trait mean up to 46.56% and 39.16%, respectively. The three studied factors affected the trait mean significantly as M1D2SA50 treatment had the highest percentage of infected roots (77.79%)

(67.44%).

Roots surface area (cm²): The roots surface area increased significantly in response to the mycorrhizal infection and M1 treatment was superior recording 113.6 cm², also, the roots surface area achieving significant increase at the D2 irrigation interval giving 123.6 cm². Salicylic acid spraying at the concentration of 50 mg l⁻¹ achieved a significant increase about 116.0 cm². The roots surface area at M1D2 treatment was significantly increased reaching 131.4 cm². The interaction between mycorrhiza and salicylic acid at the M1SA50 treatment was significantly higher than the other treatments scoring 127.3 cm². Irrigation intervals interacted significantly with the salicylic acid levels resulting in the superiority of both M1D2SA50 and M1D4SA50 treatments which had a higher roots surface area reached 146.4 cm² and 144.1 cm².

Interaction between the irrigation intervals and salicylic acid levels, increased the length of lateral roots which was

significantly increased at D2SA50 and D4SA50 treatments reaching 32.58 cm and 32.02 cm, respectively. The studied factors showed significant interaction values and both M1D2SA50 and M1D4SA50 treatments were significantly higher than the other interacted treatments giving 39.10 cm and 38.40 cm, respectively. This may be due to the ability of these fungi to synthesize and/or release a group of active compounds that have a considerable function in improving physiological processes and increasing plants capability to absorb water, micro- and macronutrients, which in turn improves plant growth (Kaschuk et al., 2010, Lopez et al., 2010). In addition, mycorrhiza participate effectively in secreting Acc-Deminase, which enters the pathway of ethylene and inhibits plants aging via conserving chlorophyll and improving photosynthesis rate (Lalitha, 2017). All the previously mentioned effects will in turn contributes to the production of many plant hormones, including auxins and gibberellins, which in turn activate the cell division and extension, thus increasing plant height, leaf area and stem diameter, in addition to crucial role of increasing absorption of other nutrients such as potassium, which contributes to the building of carbohydrates and proteins (Richardson et al., 2009).

References

- Abohatem M., F. Chakrafl, F. Jaiti, A. Dihazi and M. Baaziz (2011). Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi Limit Incidence of *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. albedinis on Date Palm Seedlings by increasing Nutrient Contents Total Phenols and Peroxidase Activities . *The Open Horticulture Journal*, 4: 10-16.
- Abood, K.H. (2016). Effect of mycorrhiza and alpha-tocopherol in the tolerance of Lisianthus Eustoma grandiflorum (Raf) shinn to salinity. Dissertation-Plant Production Technology. Technical College- Middle Euphrates University.
- Albdali, H.M.M. (2002). Effect of some nutrients and gibberellic acid in the flower production of *Dianthus caryophyllus* L. Coll. of Agriculture-Univ. of Baghdad. Iraq.
- Álvarez, S. and M.J. Sánchez Blanco (2014). Long term effect of salinity on plant quality, water relations, photosynthetic parameters and ion distribution in Callistemon citrinus. *Plant Biology*, **16(4):** 757-764.þ
- Bashan, Y. and L.E. De-Bashan (2010). How the plant growthpromoting bacterium *Azospirillum* promotes plant growtha critical assessment. In *Advances in agronomy*, **108**: pp. 77-136. Academic Press.
- Bates, C.J., C.J. Prynne and C.I. Levene (1972). Ascorbatedependent differences in the hydroxylation of proline and lysine in collagen synthesized by 3T6 fibroblasts in culture. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Protein Structure*, **278(3):** 610-616.
- Cha-um, S. and C. Kirdmanee (2009). Effect of salt stress on proline accumulation, photosynthetic ability and growth characters in two maize cultivars. *Pak. J. of Bot.*, **41(1)**: 87-98.
- Doley, K. and P.K. Jite (2013). Disease management and biochemical changes in groundnut inoculated with *Glomus fasciculatum* and pathogenic *Macrophomina phaseolina* (Tassi) Goid. *Plant Sciences Feed*, 3(2): 21-26.
- Elrys, A.S., A.I. Abdo and E.S.M. Desoky (2018). Potato tubers contamination with nitrate under the influence of nitrogen fertilizers and spray with molybdenum and salicylic acid. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 25(7): 7076-7089.
- Elsahhokie, M.M. (2013). Breeding Crops For Abiotic Stress Tolerance-Molecular and epigenetic insight. Univ. of Baghdad. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research.- Iraq.
- Ghoohestana, A. G.S.M. Hadi, Zahedi and D. Ali (2012). Effect of seed priming -growth parameters and some enzyme activities in salinity stressed.
- Hayat, Q., S. Hayat, M. Irfan and A. Ahmad (2010). Effect of exogenous salicylic acid under changing environment: a

review. *Environmental and experimental botany*, **68(1)**: 14-25.

- Kormanik, P.P., R.C. Schultz and W.C. Bryan (1982). The influence of vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizae on the growth and development of eight hardwood tree species. *Forest Science*, **28(3):** 531-539.b
- Kaschuk, G., P.A. Loffolaar, K.E. Giller, O. Alberton, M. Hungria and T.W. Kuyper (2010). Responses of legumes to rhizobia and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi a meta-analysis of potential photosynthate limitation of symbieses soil. *Boil. Biochem.*, 42(1): 125-127.
- Liu, Z.M., M.M. Yue, D.Y. Yang, S.B. Zhu, N.N. Ma and Q.W. Meng (2017). Over-expression of SIJA2 decreased heat tolerance of transgenic tobacco plants via salicylic acid pathway. *Plant cell reports*, **36(4)**: 529-542.
- Lopez-Perez, C.A., L.A. Valdez-Aguilar, V. Robldo, Torres, R. Mendoza-Villarrealy and M. Castillo-Gonzalez (2014). Calcium imparts tolerance to high electrical conductivity in lisianthus (*Eustoma grandiflorum* Raf. Shinne). *Rev. mex. Science. Agric.*, 5(7): 1193-1204.
- Lalitha, S. (2017). Plant Growth–Promoting Microbes: A Boon for Sustainable Agriculture. In *Sustainable Agriculture towards Food Security* (pp. 125-158). Springer, Singapore.b
- Olsen, S.R. and L.M. Sommers (1982). Phosphorous in A.L page. (Ed). Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiologgical properties 2 nd edition. Amer. Soc. of Agron. Inc. Soil Scs. Sco. Am. Inc. Madision.
- Purcarea, C., P. Adriana, P. Liviu, C. Adriana and E.B. Gheophe (2010). Exogenase Salicylic acid involvement on some physiological parameters amelioration in salt stressed wheat (*Triticum aestivum CV*. Crisana) plantlets. Analele University din Oradea, Fascicula: Protectia Mediului, XV: 160-165
- Richardson, A.E., J.M. Barea, A.M. Mc, Neil and C. Claire prigent-combaret (2009). Acquisition of phosphor and nitrogen in the rhizosphere and plant growth promotion by microorganisms. plant Siol, 321, p: 305–339.
- Smith S.E. and D.J. Read (2008). Mycorrhizal symbiosis. San diago CA: academic Press. Z.A. Siddiqui and J. Pichtel (2008). Mycorrhizae: an overview. In *Mycorrhizae: Sustainable Agriculture and Forestry* (pp. 1-35). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Wis., U.S and M.A. Joslyn (1970). Methods in food analysis. Physical. chemical and instrumentel Methods of analysis. 2nd ed. Academic press Newyork and London. (2) *Journal* of stress physiology and biochemistry, 6(3): 64-90.
- Yang, M., P.A. Cobine, S. Molik. A. Naranuntarat, R. Lill, D.R. Winge and V.C. Culotta (2006). The effects of mitochondrial iron homeostasis on cofactor specificity of superoxide dismutase 2. *The EMBO Journal*, 25(8): 1775-1783.